

need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgett, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

Neither party objected to the M&R. Therefore, the court reviews for clear error. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 8], DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE all of Traynham’s claims other than his claim against Clinard under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourth Amendment, and DISMISSES all defendants other than Clinard from the case.

SO ORDERED. This 6 day of May, 2025.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge